REMARKS

Claims Status

Prior to entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1-3, 5-17, and 19-27 were pending in this application. In the Office action, claims 1-3, 5-17, and 19-27 were rejected. In this Amendment and Response, claims 1, 6, 14, 15, and 20 are amended, and claims 8-10, 23-24 are cancelled, without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to pursue these claims in continutation applications. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification, and no new matter has been added.

Upon entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1-3, 5-7, 11-17, 19-22, and 25-27 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objections and rejections in light of the amendments and comments made here.

Claim Rejections

Applicants' counsel thanks the Examiner for the detailed Response to Arguments presented in the Office action.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiners comments regarding the claim limitations and § 112. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims reciting pseudorandom selection are indeed enabled. One skilled in the art can understand that a technology has certain characteristics and understand how to practice the technology, even if it is not mathematically provable. In the interest of furthering prosecution of the application, however, Applicants have amended the independent claims to remove the limitation that allegedly raised issues under § 112, rendering this rejection moot. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited art.

As amended, claim 1 recites that the method is "perform[ed] by each node in the network of nodes" Applicants respectfully submit that neither Brady nor Flammer teach or suggest a method in which each cooperating node repeatedly sends cooperating information to a randomly or pseudorandomly chosen one other node.

Rather, Brady transmits a query to "all immediate neighbor nodes." Likewise, in the portion cited in previous Office Actions, Flammer states:

> Two solutions other than the current invention have been suggested to solve the overload problem in a large network. The first suggested solution is to selectively but randomly address a small group of nodes in a reception region. While this reduces the number of packets in circulation, it also runs counter to the intention to broadcast a packet throughout a network with addressing an underlying problem....
>
> Col.1, lines 54-60.

Applicants note that this discussion in Flammer does not state that one node of all cooperating nodes is chosen. Rather, Flammer discusses choosing "a small group of nodes in a reception region." Thus, Flammer apparently broadcasts to a group located in the reception region, and not individually to a node selected from the entire set of cooperating nodes. Thus Flammer does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, withdrawl of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of claims 1-3, 5-7, 11-17, 19-22, and 25-27 in due course. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone at the number below to discuss any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: JAN. 26, 2006
Reg. No. 41,059

Ira V. Heffan
Attorney for Applicants
Goodwin Procter LLP
Exchange Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
Customer No. 051414

Tel. No.: (617) 570-1777
Fax No.: (617) 523-1231

2666573